

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 8 and 10 – 19 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 5, 9 – 13, 16 - 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gyory et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,671,048). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a seal for sealing rotating shafts, or rods that move back and forth, comprising a sealing element for sealing the shaft or rod. The sealing element has a sealing surface or a sealing edge provided with a facing formed of a nonwoven material impregnated with a polymer dispersion, wherein the nonwoven material is inserted into a recess of the sealing element and is held therein in an interlocking manner. This subject matter was previously found in claim 9, and is described, for example, in Figures 1-4 and 8-9 of the application. Gyory does not anticipate such a seal.

More specifically, Gyory merely teaches a seal with a sealing lip 16 including a sealing lip termination 19. At the sealing lip termination 19 is disposed a mat 21 composed of low friction polymeric fibers. The mat 21, however, is not inserted into a recess of the sealing element and held therein in an interlocking manner, as claimed. Because Gyory is completely silent with respect to such a configuration, the claimed seal defined by claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim is not anticipated.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Gyory does not disclose a nonwoven material in the sense of the present application. That is, Gyory merely discloses filaments or fibers arranged in a plane and then made into a web and bonded to each other by the use of heat or by application of an adhesive or the like. Although polymer fibers may also be used, these fibers are only taught in the form of a felt or a felt mat in which the fibers are intertwined and felted, for example with a carding machine, and then compressed on a fulling machine. Since Gyory merely teaches felts, the bonding of nonwoven fabrics is not disclosed and, therefore, not anticipated.

With respect to claim 13, claim 13 now recites a V-shaped sealing element. This subject matter is depicted, for example, in Figures 8 and 11. Again, Gyory is completely silent with respect to such a configuration.

More particularly, Gyory merely teaches a "sealing lip 16 which is tapered on one side, its outer side, as at 17, and slightly less tapered, as at 17a, on its opposite side. . ." Gyory at column 2, lines 64-65. A sealing lip that is merely tapered on both sides, however, is not the same as the claimed V-shaped sealing element. Because the sealing lip of Gyory is not V-shaped, the claimed invention of claim 13 and each corresponding dependent claim is not anticipated.

Lastly, with respect to claim 19, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed sliding seal is not anticipated. That is, claim 19 recites a sliding seal comprising a first ring with a facing. The facing is comprised of a nonwoven material impregnated with a polymer and in sliding contact with a second ring, wherein the first ring and second ring are sealed against a housing and a shaft or rod. This is depicted, for example, in Figure 6 of the application.

Gyory is completely silent with respect to such a sliding seal. This is because Gyory only teaches a single ring 20. There is no disclosure in Gyory with respect to a sliding seal having a first ring with a facing comprised of a nonwoven material that is in sliding contact with a second ring. Because Gyory fails to disclose these aspects of the claimed invention, claim 18 is not anticipated.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 – 8 and 14 - 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gyory in view of Petrak (U.S. Pat. No. 5,655,781). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 and 14 – 15 are dependent on either independent claim 1 or 13, addressed above. Since claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Gyory, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Gyory with the teachings of Petrak to arrive at the claimed invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2005

By: 
Philip E. Rettig, Reg. No. 34,000
Jason A. Heist, Reg. No. 51,797

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

PER/JAH